

REMARKS

Claims 1–7, 9–16 and 18–20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5–7, 10–16 and 18 – 20 are amended and claims 8 and 17 are canceled. The amendments to claims 5–7, 16 and 19 correct antecedent basis. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 10–16, 18 and 20 can be found, for example, in canceled claims 8 and 17 and paragraphs [0015] and [0095] of the published application. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance in view of at least the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Zhang in the December 8, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 10–18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the original disclosure does not support the recitation "computer program product." The Office Action also rejects claims 10–18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly not reciting statutory subject matter because "computer program product" is not defined in the specification and is allegedly functionally descriptive material. Claims 10–16, 18 and 20 are amended to comply with §112 and §101. Page 4, lines 11–14, and page 18, line 31, through page 19, line 2, of the specification (paragraphs [0015] and [0095] of the published application) recite that the program is stored on a removable computer readable medium such as a CD-ROM or a fixed computer readable medium such as a hard disk. Thus, as discussed during the personal interview and agreed by Examiner Zhang, the specification and claims do not recite functionally descriptive material because the program is recorded on a computer readable medium. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the above rejections.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,707,571 (Kurashina) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,371,670 (Kojo); and rejects claims 2–8, 11–17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kurashina in view of Kojo and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,609,208 (Wrobel). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As discussed during the personal interview and agreed by Examiner Zhang, the cited references fail to teach or suggest "a recommended width determination system," as recited in claim 1, and "a recommended width determination step," as recited in claim 10. The Office Action concedes that Kurashina and Wrobel fail to disclose the above recited features but alleges that Kojo cures their deficiencies. However, Kojo merely discloses measuring one dimension of an object to determine the total length of tape required to encircle the circumference of the object without the need of actually measuring the object (Kojo at col. 8, lines 28–46). Kojo discloses the shapes and operational expressions used for determining the total length of the tape needed to encircle an outer circumference of an object at a desired winding part (Kojo at Figs. 9 and 10). The Office Action confuses the determination of the total length of tape used for encircling the outer circumference of an object with the determination of the "width of the tape-like print medium to be wound around the cable-like member based on the external diameter," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 10. The Office Action alleges that "Kojo does not specify an informing system for informing a user of the recommended width determined by the recommended width determination system" (Office Action at page 7) but fails to acknowledge that Kojo fails to teach the "recommended width determination system" itself, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Kojo fails to cure the deficiencies of Kurashina and Wrobel.

In view of the deficiencies of the cited references, claims 1 and 10 are patentable. Further, dependent claims 2–7, 11–16, 19 and 20 are patentable, at least in view of their dependency on claims 1 and 10 and the failure of the presumption that Kurashina, Kojo and

Wrobel teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 10, as well as for the additional features the dependent claims recite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

The Office Action rejects claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kurashina in view of Kojo in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,109,798 (Nunokawa). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is based on the presumption that Kurashina, Kojo and Wrobel teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 10. Because, as discussed above, Kurashina, Kojo and Wrobel do not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 10, the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:KRG/jnm

Date: December 8, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
